arXiv:1512.00589v2 [quant-ph] 18 Oct 2016

Complete framework for efficient characterisation of non-Markovian processes

Felix A. Pollock,[1] César Rodríguez-Rosario,[2] Thomas Frauenheim,[2] Mauro Paternostro,[3] and Kavan Modi[1,*]

[1]*School of Physics & Astronomy, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3800, Australia*
[2]*Bremen Center for Computational Materials Science, University of Bremen, Am Fallturm 1, D-28359, Bremen, Germany*
[3]*School of Mathematics and Physics, Queens University, Belfast BT7 1NN, United Kingdom*

(Dated: October 19, 2016)

A non-Markovian process is one that retains 'memory' of its past. A systematic understanding of these processes is necessary to fully describe and harness a vast range of complex phenomena; however, no such general characterisation currently exists. This long-standing problem has hindered advances in understanding physical, chemical and biological processes, where often dubious theoretical assumptions are made to render a dynamical description tractable. Moreover, the methods commonly used to treat non-Markovian quantum dynamics are plagued with unphysical results, like non-positive dynamics. Here we develop an operational framework to characterise arbitrary non-Markovian quantum processes. We demonstrate the universality of our framework and how the characterisation can be rendered efficient, before formulating a necessary and sufficient condition for quantum Markov processes. Finally, we stress how our framework enables the actual systematic analysis of non-Markovian processes, the understanding of their typicality, and the development of new master equations for the effective description of memory-bearing open-system evolution.

When a system (S) interacts with an environment (E), it is said to be open. The dynamics due to the system-environment (S-E) interaction can be much more complicated than the dynamics of S alone. Often, the size of E makes a full dynamical description intractable. It is thus practical to make approximations about E. The most common and powerful of them is the *Markov approximation*, where it is assumed that E is effectively unchanged by its coupling to S, and hence retains no memory of past interactions. The Markov approximation is justified only when E is very large, and the timescales of its dynamics are fast compared to those of the dynamics of S. The resulting dynamics is very well understood and can be characterised successfully [1].

However, there are many interesting physical scenarios where the Markov assumption cannot be invoked [2]. In most such instances, the characterisation of the ensuing dynamics poses many challenges. To overcome these difficulties, one must consider that E might have some memory of previous states of S. However, this is far from straightforward, and significantly complicates any theoretical description [3]. This is particularly true in the quantum regime, where the timescales of the interaction between S and E are often comparable to those of the dynamics of the system alone. This has been known since the early days of the spin echo technique, where non-Markovian effects are exploited to preserve quantum coherence [4]. Understanding such non-Markovian dynamics is essential for novel applications of quantum technologies [5], and the harnessing of complex processes occurring, for instance, in artificial nanostructures, bio-molecular and biochemical processes [6]. Here, we propose a complete, efficient and robust framework for characterising such dynamics with arbitrary accuracy, and without any prior knowledge of, or assumptions about, the underlying system-environment dynamics.

The dynamics between any two time steps of a quantum Markov process can be characterised by a completely-positive trace preserving (CPTP) map. However, the simplest non-Markovian dynamics arises when, in the same setting, the initial S-E state is correlated. Already here, the CPTP description of the dynamics breaks down. Pechukas has shown that, in order to describe the dynamics in the presence of initial S-E correlations, we must give up something [7, 8], e.g. complete positivity (CP) or linearity [9]. Needless to say, neither of these two options is desirable, creating a double-bind. The operational interpretation of non-CP or nonlinear maps is not clear, and they can lead to predictions of unphysical behaviour [10, 11]. These troubling features remain when describing general (and more complex) non-Markovian dynamics [12–15].

To overcome the double-bind, we propose a third option: to give up altogether the notion of initial states of S as the inputs of the map. This is because an independent set of input states of S is not well defined when S is correlated with E [16]. If we recognise that, in order to prepare a desired state of S, we must, in reality, implement some external control operation, then it is natural to treat these operations as the inputs to the process [17], which in turn yields the final state of S. This is an operationally sound way of characterising dynamics when the initial S-E state is correlated. By 'operational' we mean that this method constructs a mapping from the choice of experimentally implementable controls to experimentally measurable output states [18]. Moreover, the resultant map, known as a *superchannel*, is both CP and linear, and has been recently experimentally constructed [19].

In this article, we generalise the superchannel formalism to characterise arbitrary quantum processes, including those which are non-Markovian, without any assumptions about the underlying system dynamics. We construct a mapping, which we call the *process tensor*, from the set of possible control operations to output states. We show that such a mapping is universal, by proving that it describes all quantum processes and can be simulated with a quantum circuit. Moreover, the process tensor has a matrix-product-state representation [20], which can be efficiently constructed using a set of bipartite entangled states. Most importantly, our method offers con-

* kavan.modi@monash.edu



Figure 1. *A quantum process.* The system S is initially in some state ρ_0. Then, generalised operations $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0} = \{\mathcal{A}_{k-1}; \mathcal{A}_{k-2}; \ldots; \mathcal{A}_1; \mathcal{A}_0\}$ are performed on the system, where the subscripts label the corresponding time step. The generalised operations represent the full range of direct control a potential experimentalist has over the evolution of S. The process is characterised by a map $\mathcal{T}_{k:0}$ that we can use to predict the output state $\rho_k = \mathcal{T}_{k:0}[\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}]$ for any choice of control operations.

siderable advantages over previous approaches to the characterisation of non-Markovianity, as it does not suffer from unphysical behaviour and provides clear dynamical interpretations. Our method is robust and general, and offers precision limited only by experimental resources.

We also give a necessary and sufficient condition for quantum Markov processes, and derive an operationally motivated measure for non-Markovianity. We then discuss several applications of our framework, which pave the way to systematically working with non-Markovian processes for both technological and foundational purposes.

Operational framework.— We consider a quantum system undergoing a process that we split into arbitrary discrete time steps, labeled by $k \in [0, K]$, where we do not assume anything about the intermediate dynamics. When the time steps are chosen to be closely spaced, they will approximate a continuous-time evolution. Within this setting, we begin by giving an operational definition of process characterisation:

Definition 1 *A quantum process is said to be characterised for K time steps when the state of the system can be predicted at any time step $0 \leq k < K$. The system may be subjected to arbitrary quantum operations $\mathcal{A}$ at previous time steps. The mapping from the sequence of operations $\mathbf{A}_{k-1;0} := \{\mathcal{A}_{k-1}; \ldots; \mathcal{A}_1; \mathcal{A}_0\}$ to the state ρ_k, given by*

$$\rho_k := \mathcal{T}_{k:0}[\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}], \tag{1}$$

fully characterises the process. We call $\mathcal{T}_{k:0}$ the process tensor.

We have graphically illustrated Definition 1 in Figure 1. The definition of the process tensor forms the basic building block of this work. Operations $\mathbf{A}$ (where we have omitted the subscripts) are called *control operations*: they represent all the possible manipulations of the system that an experimentalist could perform, and are mathematically described by CPTP maps [21], and may even be correlated with one another (cf. Appendix B for details). Their only restriction is that they must act on S alone. An important subset of control operations is the combination of a measurement followed by a preparation. This definition represents the idea that an experimentalist can perform available operations on the system many times, in many ways, and that constitutes the effective process accessible for the experiment.

The process tensor is a mapping from the set $\mathbf{A}$ to a quantum state. Thus, its output is required to be Hermitian and to have unit trace. Furthermore, it should satisfy the following properties to be physically relevant

(P1) *Linearity:* $\mathcal{T}[p\mathbf{A} + (1-p)\mathbf{B}] = p\mathcal{T}[\mathbf{A}] + (1-p)\mathcal{T}[\mathbf{B}]$ for any $p \in [0, 1]$. This property embodies the linearity of mixing, which must hold for any stochastic theory.

(P2) *Complete positivity:* If the controls act on the system S undergoing the process and an ancilla A, the final S-A state should still be physical. Therefore $\mathcal{T}^S \otimes \mathcal{I}^A[\mathbf{A}^{SA}] = \rho^{SA} \geq 0$, where $\mathcal{I}^A$ is the identity process on the ancilla; this must be true for any $\mathbf{A}^{SA}$. This is analogous to CP for quantum operations.

(P3) *Containment:* For $k \geq k' \geq j' \geq j$, the process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{k':j'}$ is contained in $\mathcal{T}_{k:j}$. That is, if we have the full process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{K:0}$, then we can describe the dynamics between any intermediate time steps, and $\mathcal{T}_{k':j'}$ can be obtained from $\mathcal{T}_{k:j}$.

Since the process tensor maps control operations instead of initial system states, it is fundamentally different from any other non-Markovian criterion [22–26]. Moreover, it differs from non-Markovian master equations, which seek to relate changes in the state of a system at a given time to its initial state and the effects of a memory kernel; this may be microscopically derived or phenomenological in nature [3, 27, 28]. Non-Markovian master equations, including those based on the use of projection operators [3, 28], tend to be poorly conditioned, and their accuracy (and even physicality) can vary wildly for different initial states. In contrast, the process tensor is a linear mapping from the full set of control parameters $\mathbf{A}$ to the state at a desired time step; $\mathcal{T}$ given in Definition 1 fully describes a process—even when it involves strong system-environment coupling—and is guaranteed to have physical outputs.

Open quantum evolution ⇔ Process tensor.— We use the term open quantum evolution (OQE) to describe a system S interacting with its environment E, where the joint S-E dynamics is driven by unitary evolution. As above, the system may be interrogated, interrupted, or manipulated at intermediary time steps by controls $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0} = \{\mathcal{A}_{k-1} \ldots \mathcal{A}_0\}$, which are simply CPTP operations.

We can write the total dynamics as

$$\rho_k^{SE} := \mathcal{U}_{k:k-1}\, \mathcal{A}_{k-1}\, \mathcal{U}_{k-1:k-2} \ldots \mathcal{A}_1\, \mathcal{U}_{1:0}\, \mathcal{A}_0\, [\rho_0^{SE}], \tag{2}$$

where ρ_0^{SE} is the initial S-E state, $\{\mathcal{U}\}$ are unitary maps on the S-E space given by $\mathcal{U}_{j:i}[\rho_i^{SE}] = U_{j:i}\rho_i^{SE}\, U_{j:i}^\dagger = \rho_j^{SE}$, and ρ_k^{SE} is the state of S-E at time step k. The state of the system is obtained by tracing over the environment as $\rho_k^S = \mathrm{tr}_E[\rho_k^{SE}]$. Equation (2) is the full quantum mechanical description of the joint S-E evolution. We now formalise the relationship between the process tensor and OQE with the following two Theorems.

Theorem 2 *The state of a system undergoing an open quantum evolution at any time step k is given by a process tensor, which satisfies the properties* **(P1)–(P3)**.

The proof, given in Appendix C, constructs $\mathcal{T}_{k:0}$ explicitly by writing down the matrix indices for all objects in Eq. (2). Specifically, we show that the action of the process tensor can be written as the operator-sum decomposition

$$\rho = \mathcal{T}[\mathbf{A}] = \sum_l T_l \, \mathbf{A} \, T_l^\dagger, \tag{3}$$

with the operators $\{T_l\}$ defined in Eq. (C6). The second equality implies complete positivity (and linearity) of $\mathcal{T}$. The containment property also arises naturally from our construction.

It is not immediately obvious that the converse of Theorem 2 holds. That is, do all operationally defined processes admit a quantum mechanical description? For CPTP maps, Stinespring's dilation theorem states that this is the case [29], whereas here we only have Eq. (1) and properties **(P1)-(P3)** as a starting point. We now show the that all process tensors are consistent with *some* OQE, and hence can be simulated with the aid of ancillas.

Theorem 3 *Any process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{k:0}$ is consistent with an OQE of Eq. (2) form, where the environment is simulated by k ancillas of increasing dimension $d_{A_j} \geq d^{2(3^j)}$.*

Appendix D contains a proof of this theorem, for which we make use of the supermaps formalism introduced in Ref. [30]. In a nutshell, we show that each step of a process can be described by a supermap, and that this implies a unitary representation for the dynamics during that step. By induction, the unitary representation, or dilation, of the full process tensor follows.

The two theorems above show that the process tensor is the most general descriptor for a quantum process. The direct correspondence between OQE and the process tensor proves its universality. Theorem 3 additionally provides a recipe for simulating general (discrete-time) non-Markovian dynamics. Given a process tensor description of the dynamics, a set of unitary operations $\{\mathcal{U}_{j:j-1}\}$ and ancilla states $\{\eta_j\}$ can be (non-uniquely) determined which, when applied using the quantum circuit in Figure 2, fully simulate the reduced dynamics of the system.



Figure 2. *Quantum circuit to simulate the process tensor.* Any process tensor can be simulated by the quantum circuit above. For each time step an ancilla of dimension $d_j \geq (\sum_{n=0}^{j-1} d_n + d_S)^2$ and prepared in a state η_j is introduced. The unitary at each step can be decomposed as $U_{j:j-1} = V_j W_{j:j-1}$, where $W_{j:j-1}$ acts on the system and all previous ancilla and V_j acts on all subsystems including the new ancilla. See Appendix D for a detailed proof of Theorem 3.

Of particular note is the doubly-exponential growth of dimension in the ancilla space—a k-step process corresponds to open evolution with an environment of total dimension $d_{\text{sim}} \geq d^{3^k-1}$. Though this prevents efficient simulation of the most general processes, in many cases the environment is of fixed finite dimension. We now demonstrate that, even though the process tensor itself grows exponentially with the number of time steps, it can nevertheless be constructed efficiently.

Direct tomography.— We begin by showing that the process tensor can be determined in a finite number of experiments. Note that $\mathbf{A}$ is a collection of quantum operations and the process tensor acts on $\mathbf{A}$ linearly. Moreover $\mathbf{A}$ itself is a linear operation. That is, an operation $\mathcal{A}$, acting on the system at a given time step, is a linear map on the density operator of the system. At each time step j, it can be uniquely decomposed in terms of a fixed set of linearly independent operations $\{\mathcal{A}_j^{(\mu,\nu)_j}\}$ as $\mathcal{A}_j = \sum_{(\mu,\nu)} \alpha_{(\mu,\nu)_j} \mathcal{A}_j^{(\mu,\nu)_j}$, with $\alpha_{(\mu,\nu)_j} \in \mathbb{R}$. Note that the coefficients $\alpha_{(\mu,\nu)_j}$ are not necessarily positive, meaning the expansion above is linear but not convex (see Appendix E for a discussion). Any control operation can be linearly expanded in terms of a fixed set of control operations that span the space as

$$\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0} = \sum_{(\mu,\nu)} \bigotimes_{j=0}^{k-1} \alpha_{(\mu,\nu)_j} \mathcal{A}_j^{(\mu,\nu)_j}. \tag{4}$$

See Figure 3 for a convenient choice of operations.

This procedure is simply a process tomography [5] involving many time-steps. As with any quantum tomography, the scaling is not favourable. An operation on any d-dimensional system can be expressed in terms of $\mathcal{O}(d^2)$ measurement operators and d^2 preparations. Thus, the expansion of $\mathbf{A}_{k:0}$ requires $\mathcal{O}(d^{4k})$ linearly independent combinations of preparations and measurements. This may seem like an obstacle in characterising non-Markovian processes. However, it is still possible to tomographically reconstruct a partial process tensor with a smaller set of controls [31]. There is also a way around the scaling issue by mapping the process tomography problem into a state tomography problem.

Efficient state representation of the process tensor.— Any quantum process on a d-dimensional system that is described by a CPTP map Λ can be equivalently represented by a d^2-dimensional quantum state through the Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism (CJI) [29]. To do this operationally, we simply let the map act on one half of a maximally entangled state: $\Upsilon = \Lambda \otimes \mathcal{I}\left[|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|\right]$, where $|\psi^+\rangle = \sum_j |jj\rangle / \sqrt{d}$ and $\{|j\rangle\}$ is an orthonormal basis. Each matrix element of Λ corresponds to a matrix element of Υ.

From the perspective of the number of parameters that must be fixed, characterising the state corresponding to a process appears no easier than characterising the process itself. However, a range of techniques have been developed for efficient quantum state tomography [32, 33]. Owing to the CJI, such techniques are immediately available for quantum process tomography. Here, we develop an analogue of the CJI for more



Figure 3. *Full-process tomography.* The system initially has reduced state ρ_0. In a convenient, but not unique scheme for full tomography, it is measured at each time step and then freshly prepared. That is, the preparation at step k is independent of the previous measurements and preparations. A linear combination of measurements and preparations, each chosen from a set that linearly spans the operator space, is sufficient to span the space of control operations. Having statistics for all possible measurements and preparations at all times is sufficient to construct $\mathcal{T}$. See Appendix E for details.

general processes, namely those that can be described by the process tensor, which will make such processes amenable to efficient characterisation.

As the process tensor describing a k-step process has $4k+2$ indices, and hence d^{4k+2} elements, the minimal state representation for this process must be that of $2k+1$ systems of dimension d. This extensivity of the number of systems with the number of time steps suggests that the process can be mapped onto a many-body state of k pairs of d-dimensional systems, with one additional system. Our claim is formalised in the following theorem:

Theorem 4 *Any k-step process can be operationally represented by the state $\Upsilon_{k:0}$ of a $2k+1$–body system. This state further corresponds to a pure matrix-product state of a $(2k+3)$–body system [20].*

The generalised CJI state $\Upsilon_{k:0}$ corresponding to the process tensor $\mathcal{T}_{k:0}$ can be prepared with the circuit presented in Figure 4. We provide a detailed proof of this theorem in Appendix F, where we use the dilated OQE in Eq. (2) to demonstrate that the elements of the density operator that results from the circuit in Figure 4 are exactly the elements of the corresponding process tensor.

The CJI state representation allows direct access to important properties of the operational process. Operational and mathematical tools developed to understand quantum states can now be applied directly to general dynamical quantum processes. For example, unitary evolution can immediately be tested for by checking the purity of reduced states of $\Upsilon_{k:0}$—the CJI state of a unitary map is pure. Additionally, in a manifestation of the containment property, we can use $\Upsilon_{k:0}$ to recover the CJI state $\Upsilon_{k':j'}$ corresponding to a process tensor contained in $\mathcal{T}_{k:0}$, with $k \geq k' \geq j' \geq 0$. In Appendix G, we obtain the CPTP map $\mathcal{P}_{k':j'}$, which acts between the time-steps j' and k' after averaging over operations $\mathcal{A}$ at previous time steps. This requires projecting ancillas corresponding to intermediate time-steps onto the maximally entangled state $\Psi^+ = |\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|$ and tracing out over all those that are external to the interval in question:



Figure 4. *Generalised Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism.* This quantum circuit prepares the state that represents the process tensor, element by element. The resources required are k maximally entangled pairs of ancillas of dimension d. That is $k\ \log(d)$ ebits. Correlations between pairs of ancillas in $\Upsilon_{k:0}$ correspond directly to the memory inherent in the non-Markovian evolution. Any desired element of this state can be sampled using the techniques of quantum state tomography. See Appendix F for a detailed proof of Theorem 4.

$$(\mathcal{P}_{k':j'} \otimes \mathcal{I})\left[\Psi^+\right] = \mathrm{tr}_{\overline{A_{j'-1}B_{k'}}}\left[\bigotimes_{j'<l<k'} \Psi_l^+ \Upsilon_{k:0}\right], \quad (5)$$

where $\{A_n, B_n\}$ are the ancillas introduced in Figure 4 and $\overline{A_{j'-1}B_{k'}}$ implies trace over all unmentioned subsystems.

In the second part of our proof, we show that, with the addition of two extra ancillas, the process tensor can be described by a pure, matrix-product state. From this representation it is clear that the number of independent elements of the process tensor does not grow exponentially with the number of time steps k, but linearly: the size of the matrix product state and hence the process tensor grows as $\mathcal{O}(kd_S^2D)$, where D is the bond dimension of the state. In general, $D \leq d_E^2$ with d_E the dimension of the environment. This is reassuring, since the description should not be more complex than the corresponding OQE. Even though the environment dimension could be large, there is always a consistent OQE with $d_E = d^{3^k-1}$, and we expect the effective bond dimension to be much smaller than this in practice; often only part of the environment interacts with the system at any given time. This comprises a significantly more efficient representation for processes with many time steps. We now move to quantum Markov processes and make use of generalised CJI states to better understand them.

Criterion for quantum Markov process.— To clearly define a quantum Markov process, we introduce the idea of a *causal break*. We begin by noting that the state of the system at time step l will depend on previous control operations, $\rho_l = \rho_l(\mathbf{A}_{l-1:0})$. Now suppose at time step $k < l$ we make a measurement (of our choice) on the system and observe outcome r, which occurs with probability $p_k^{(r)}$. We denote the



Figure 5. *Determining whether a quantum process is Markovian.* Generalised operations $\mathbf{A}_{k:0}$ are made on the system during a quantum process, where the subscripts represent the time. At time step k we make a causal break by measuring the system with $\Pi_k^{(r)}$ and re-preparing it in randomly chosen state $P_k^{(s)}$. The process is said to be Markovian if and only if $\rho_l(P_k|\Pi_k^{(r)};\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) = \rho_l(P_k^{(s)})$ at all time steps l, k, for all inputs $P_k^{(s)}$, measurements $\{\Pi_k^{(r)}\}$, and control operations $\{\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}\}$.

operator corresponding to this outcomes as $\Pi_k^{(r)}$. We then re-prepare the system into a known state $P_k^{(s)}$, chosen randomly from some set $\{P_k^{(s)}\}$. The measurement and the re-preparation at k break the causal link between the past $j \leq k$ and the future $l > k$ of the system. If we let the system evolve to time step l, its state will depend on the choice and the outcome of the measurement at k, the preparation P_k, and the control operations from 0 to $k-1$. Therefore, we have a conditional subnormalised state $\tilde{\rho}_l = p_r \rho_l(P_k^{(s)}|\Pi_k^{(r)};\mathbf{A}_{k-2:0})$, where the conditioning argument is the choice of past measurement $\Pi_k^{(r)}$ and controls $\{\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}\}$. The probability p_r, which is also, in general, a function of the past controls $\{\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}\}$, is not relevant to whether the process is Markovian or not; we are interested only in whether the normalised state $\rho_l = \rho_l(P_k^{(s)}|\Pi_k^{(r)};\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0})$ depends on its conditioning argument.

Because of the causal break, the system itself cannot carry any information past step k about $\Pi_k^{(r)}$ or its earlier history. The only way ρ_l could depend on the controls is if the information from the past is carried across the causal break via some hidden mechanism. This is the definition of a non-Markovian memory. We have depicted this in Figure 5 with the memory as a cloud that transmits information from the past to the future across the causal break. This immediately results in the following operational criterion for a Markov process:

Definition 5 *A quantum process is Markovian when the state of the system ρ_l, after a causal break at time step k (with $l > k$), only depends on the input state $P_k^{(s)}$: $\rho_l(P_k|\Pi_k^{(r)};\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) = \rho_l(P_k^{(s)})$, $\forall\{P_k^{(s)}, \Pi_k^{(r)}, \mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}\}$ and $\forall\, l,\, k \in [0, K]$.*

Note that this definition is directly analogous to the *causal Markov condition* for a discrete-time classical stochastic evolution that allows for interventions [34]: While Markov's initial definition was written in terms of joint and conditional probability distributions over sets of underlying system states at different times, more modern descriptions of (classical) stochastic processes in terms of their causal structure allow for interventions between time steps [34]. That is, an experimenter can implement a general stochastic map between the output of a given stage of the process and the input of the subsequent stage. Of course, doing nothing is also a valid intervention, in which case the older description follows (note that doing nothing for a classical process corresponds to projective measurement in a quantum process). Recently, a generalisation of this kind of 'Markovian causal modelling' has been developed for quantum Markov processes [35].

In the case where all dynamics occurs in a fixed basis, and all controls amount to projective measurements in that basis, Definition 5 can be reduced to a statement about conditional probability distributions that directly corresponds to Markov's original definition. Moreover, using the definition of quantum Markov processes, we have the following theorem:

Theorem 6 *A quantum process is non-Markovian if and only if there exist at least two different choices of controls $\{\Pi_k^{(r)};\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}\}$ and $\{\Pi_k^{'(r')};\mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0}\}$, such that after a causal break at time step k, the conditional states of the system at time step l are different:*

$$\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}|\Pi_k^{(r)};\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) \neq \rho_l(P_k^{(s)}|\Pi_k^{'(r')};\mathbf{A}'_{k-1:0}). \qquad (6)$$

Conversely, if ρ_l is constant for all linearly independent controls, then the process is Markovian.

The proof is in Appendix H. Identifying two controls that lead to different conditional states may require testing Eq. (6) for all possible linearly independent control operations, though the discovery of any pair of control sequences that lead to an inequality in Eq. (6) is a witness for non-Markovianity. The implication of the theorem is that it is possible to determine whether a process is Markovian in a finite number of experiments. It also leads to the following corollary:

Corollary 7 *Markov processes are K-divisible, i.e., they can be written as a sequence of* CPTP *maps between the K time steps on which they are defined.*

Proof. If Definition 5 is satisfied then ρ_k only depends on the previous choice of input $P_{k-1}^{(s)}$ for any k. By choosing from a complete set of linearly independent inputs $\{P_j^{(\nu_j)}\}$, quantum process tomography can be performed independently for each pair of adjacent time steps. Since the dynamics between any two time steps is free from the past (there is no conditioning on prior operations), the resulting set of CPTP maps completely describes the dynamics. These maps can then be composed to calculate the dynamics between any two time steps. In other words, the dynamics between time steps $l > k > j$ is described by maps $\Lambda_{k:j}$, $\Lambda_{l:k}$, and $\Lambda_{l:j}$, with the last map being the composition of the former two: $\Lambda_{l:j} = \Lambda_{l:k} \circ \Lambda_{k:j}$. ■

This means our result verifies the well-known hypothesis that Markovian dynamics is divisible. However, the converse of this statement does not hold. That is, $\Lambda_{l:j} = \Lambda_{l:k} \circ \Lambda_{k:j}$ $\forall l > k > j \in [0, K]$ does not imply that the process is

Markovian according to Theorem 6. In principle, there could be multi-time correlations between time steps that affect future dynamics *conditioned* on past operations. In Appendix I, we give several examples of Markovianity witnesses within our framework, the first of which show that divisible (and even CP-divisible) dynamics does not always imply Markovian dynamics. We also show how the trace-distance definition of Markov processes can fail to detect non-Markovian memory, and that a quantum process can be non-Markovian even when there are no S-E quantum correlations.

As noted in Ref. [36], the divisibility condition $\Lambda_{l:j} = \Lambda_{l:k} \circ \Lambda_{k:j}$ implied by Corollary 7 can be seen as a generalisation of the Chapman-Kolmogorov equation. In the case that the system states at all time steps are simultaneously diagonalisable, this becomes the classical Chapman-Kolmogorov equation for outcome probabilities of measurements made in the states' eigenbasis.

It is worth noting that all OQEs generated by a time-independent S-E Hamiltonian are non-Markovian according to Theorem 6, when considering more than two time steps. A similar point was also made in Ref. [37], albeit in the context of dynamical decoupling. The strictness of Definition 5, however, does not render the notion of non-Markovianity meaningless; on the contrary, it allows us, along with the state representation for the process tensor, to construct meaningful measures of non-Markovianity.

Measuring non-Markovianity with CJI states.— To ensure a process is Markovian, there are an exponentially large number of checks in Eq. (6) that must be carried out. It is useful here to illustrate this result with the generalised CJI state for a Markov process. As we prove in Corollary 7, a Markov process is CP-divisible, i.e., it is a composition of CPTP maps. The corresponding CJI state will only have correlations between subsystems corresponding to neighbouring preparations and subsequent measurements. This allows us to define a degree of non-Markovianity

Proposition 8 *The distance between the generalised CJI state of a non-Markovian process and the closest CJI state of a Markovian process measures the degree of non-Markovianity.*

$$\mathcal{N} := \min_{\Upsilon^{\text{Markov}}_{k:0}} \mathcal{D}\left[\Upsilon_{k:0} \| \Upsilon^{\text{Markov}}_{k:0}\right]. \tag{7}$$

If we choose relative entropy [38] as the metric, then the closest Markov process is straightforwardly found by discarding the correlations. This measure of non-Markovianity has an operational interpretation: $\text{Prob}_{\text{confusion}} = \exp\{-n\mathcal{N}\}$ measures the probability of confusing the given non-Markovian process for a promised Markovian process after n measurements of the CJI state. This statement has immediate applications for secure communication and other aspects of quantum information theory [39]. Other distance measures may also be used, with different operational interpretations.

On the other hand, there are well-known methods to develop master equations for Markov processes. We can meaningfully quantify the error associated with using such methods for non-Markovian processes if we can bound their fidelity using Eq. (7). This should be possible in many cases, since large environments tend not to retain long-term memory. We anticipate that most processes of physical interest will be almost Markovian and the corresponding process tensor should be highly sparse with a block-diagonal structure.

Conclusions.— We have presented a universal framework for characterising arbitrary quantum processes, including non-Markovian ones. The process tensor is shown to be the most general descriptor of any quantum process. Our framework does not rely on any microscopic models; we only assume that experimental control operations act solely on S and do not directly influence E. This characterisation is shown to be efficient by casting the process tensor into a many-body state. We gave an operational condition for quantum Markov dynamics. Our methods can be applied to continuous control by making use of the Trotter formula for the decomposition of the dynamics of a system.

Interestingly, similar representations for general quantum stochastic processes have appeared in the literature as early as 1979 [40], albeit from a less operational starting point. More recently, the approach to modelling quantum channels with memory in Ref. [41] has lead to a similar mathematical theory. In other contexts, the mathematical structure of the process tensor is also related to other formalisms which describe maps acting on quantum operations, notably the quantum combs [42, 43], operator tensor [44], and process matrix [35, 45] frameworks. However, it has not hitherto been applied to the question of non-Markovianity *per se*; here we have constructed, for the first time, an operationally meaningful measure for the degree of non-Markovianity in a process. The representation of the process as a matrix product operator also provides a novel tool for its efficient reconstruction.

This work opens up many avenues for future research. Apart from the possibility to derive non-Markovian master equations, the process tensor can be used to systematically study the non-Markovianity of a typical process, analyze temporal quantum correlations [46] and structures without causal order [47, 48]. On the practical side, it can be used for characterising electronic dynamics in molecules using spectroscopic techniques. Also, the CP nature of the process tensor enables the calculation of its Holevo capacity [49], which bounds the information content carried by a non-Markovian channel [39]. Moreover, our approach paves the way for a general theory of non-Markovian error correction [50, 51].

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to A. Aspuru-Guzik, G. Cohen, A. Gilchrist, J. Goold, M. W. Hall, T. Le, K. Li, L. Mazzola, S. Milz, F. Sakuldee, D. Terno, S. Vinjanampathy, H. Wiseman, C. Wood, M.-H. Yung for valuable conversations. MP is supported by the EU FP7 grant TherMiQ (Grant Agreement 618074), the John Templeton Foundation (Grant No. 43467), and the UK EPSRC (EP/M003019/1).

[1] N. Van Kampen, *Stochastic Processes in Physics and Chemistry* (Elsevier Science, 2011).

[2] N. Erez, G. Gordon, M. Nest, and G. Kurizki, Nature **452**, 724

(2008).
[3] H. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, 2002).
[4] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2417 (1999).
[5] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2000).
[6] N. Lambert, Y.-N. Chen, Y.-C. Cheng, C.-M. Li, G.-Y. Chen, and F. Nori, Nat. Phys. **9**, 10 (2013).
[7] P. Pechukas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1060 (1994).
[8] R. Alicki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3020 (1995).
[9] P. Pechukas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3021 (1995).
[10] C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, K. Modi, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 012313 (2010).
[11] K. Modi and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 052119 (2010).
[12] C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Int. J. Quant. Info. **9**, 1617 (2011), [arXiv:0803.1183 (2008)].
[13] A. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Rep. Prog. Phys. **77**, 094001 (2014).
[14] H.-P. Breuer, J. Phys. B **45**, 154001 (2012).
[15] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 021002 (2016).
[16] K. Modi, Open Sys. & Info. Dyn. **18**, 253 (2011).
[17] K. Modi, Sci. Rep. **2**, 581 (2012).
[18] E. Davies and J. Lewis, Comm. Math. Phys. **17**, 239 (1970).
[19] M. Ringbauer, C. J. Wood, K. Modi, A. Gilchrist, A. G. White, and A. Fedrizzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 090402 (2015).
[20] D. Perez-Garcia, F. Verstraete, M. Wolf, and J. I. Cirac, Quant. Inf. & Comp. **7**, 401 (2007).
[21] By linearity, the process tensor's action is also defined on trace decreasing CP maps. In this case, the output of the process tensor is a subnormalised density matrix proportional to the success probability of applying the trace decreasing controls.
[22] M. M. Wolf, J. Eisert, T. S. Cubitt, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 150402 (2008).
[23] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 210401 (2009).
[24] A. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010).
[25] N. L. Gullo, I. Sinayskiy, T. Busch, and F. Petruccione, arXiv:1401.1126 (2014).
[26] D. Chruściński and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 120404 (2014).
[27] T. Yu, L. Diósi, N. Gisin, and W. T. Strunz, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 91 (1999).
[28] F. Shibata and T. Arimitsu, J. Phys. Soc. Jap. **49**, 891 (1980).
[29] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Entanglement* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).
[30] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Europhys. Lett. **83**, 30004 (2008).
[31] S. Milz, F. A. Pollock, and K. Modi, arXiv:1610.02152 (2016).
[32] M. Cramer, M. B. Plenio, S. T. Flammia, R. Somma, D. Gross, S. D. Bartlett, O. Landon-Cardinal, D. Poulin, and Y.-K. Liu, Nat. Comm. **1**, 149 (2010).
[33] D. Gross, Y.-K. Liu, S. T. Flammia, S. Becker, and J. Eisert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 150401 (2010).
[34] J. Pearl, *Causality* (Oxford University Press, 2000).
[35] F. Costa and S. Shrapnel, New J. Phys. **18**, 063032 (2016).
[36] J. Bae and D. Chruściński, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 050403 (2016).
[37] C. Arenz, R. Hillier, M. Fraas, and D. Burgarth, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 022102 (2015).
[38] V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 197 (2002).
[39] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum information theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
[40] G. Lindblad, Comm. Math. Phys. **65**, 281 (1979).
[41] D. Kretschmann and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 062323 (2005).
[42] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 060401 (2008).
[43] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, and P. Perinotti, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022339 (2009).
[44] L. Hardy, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B **370**, 3385 (2012).
[45] O. Oreshkov and N. J. Cerf, New J. Phys. **18**, 073037 (2016).
[46] T. Le, F. Pollock, T. Paterek, M. Paternostro, and K. Modi, arXiv:1510.04425 (2015).
[47] G. Chiribella, G. M. D'Ariano, P. Perinotti, and B. Valiron, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 022318 (2013).
[48] O. Oreshkov, F. Costa, and C. Brukner, Nat. Comm. **3** (2012).
[49] S. Vinjanampathy and K. Modi, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052310 (2015).
[50] G. Kalai, arXiv:1106.0485 (2011).
[51] J. Preskill, Quant. Inf. & Comp. **13**, 181 (2013).
[52] E. C. G. Sudarshan, P. Mathews, and J. Rau, Phys. Rev. **121**, 920 (1961).
[53] K. Kraus, in *States, Effects, and Operations Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory*, Vol. 190 (1983).
[54] M.-D. Choi, Can. J. Math. **24**, 520 (1972).
[55] M.-D. Choi, Lin. Alg. App. **10**, 285 (1975).
[56] W. F. Stinespring, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **6**, 211 (1955).
[57] J. Řeháček, B.-G. Englert, and D. Kaszlikowski, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 052321 (2004).
[58] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen, J. Mod. Opt. **44**, 2455 (1997).
[59] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 390 (1997).
[60] A. Kuah, K. Modi, C. A. Rodriguez, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 042113 (2007).
[61] K. Modi, C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 064102 (2012).
[62] A. Jamiołkowski, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 275 (1972).
[63] F. Verstraete, J. J. García-Ripoll, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 207204 (2004).
[64] X.-M. Lu, X. Wang, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042103 (2010).
[65] A. R. U. Devi, A. K. Rajagopal, and Sudha, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 022109 (2011).
[66] L. Mazzola, C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, K. Modi, and M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 010102 (2012).
[67] S. Campbell, A. Smirne, L. Mazzola, N. Lo Gullo, B. Vacchini, T. Busch, and M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 032120 (2012).
[68] C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, K. Modi, A.-m. Kuah, A. Shaji, and E. Sudarshan, J. Phys. A **41**, 205301 (2008).
[69] K. Modi, *A theoretical analysis of experimental open quantum dynamics*, Ph.D. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin (2008).
[70] E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and H.-P. Breuer, Europhys. Lett. **92**, 60010 (2010).
[71] C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, K. Modi, L. Mazzola, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Europhys. Lett. **99**, 20010 (2012).
[72] M. Gessner and H.-P. Breuer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 180402 (2011).
[73] M. Gessner, M. Ramm, T. Pruttivarasin, A. Buchleitner, H.-P. Breuer, and H. Haffner, Nat. Phys. **10**, 105 (2014).

Appendix A: Notation

Throughout this article CPTP control operations $\mathcal{A}$ are taken to be Hermitian, positive, trace-d matrices. Their action is defined as

$$\mathcal{A}_j[\rho_j] = \sum_{r'_j, s'_j} \mathcal{A}_{r_j r'_j; s_j s'_j} \rho_{r'_j; s'_j} \left| r_j \right\rangle \left\langle s_j \right| . \tag{A1}$$

Note that index j on the left denotes a time step. On the right we have expressed this as a subscript to matrix indices r, r', s, s'. Alternatively, we can write the action of the map in the Sudarshan-Kraus form as $\mathcal{A}(\rho) = \sum_l A_l \rho A_l^\dagger$. See the 'B-form' of the map in Ref. [52] for details of this representation of the map.

We write the action of a unitary transformation that takes the state of S-E from time step j to time step k as

$$\rho_k^{SE} = \sum_{r_k \epsilon_k s_k \gamma_k} \rho^{SE}_{r_k \epsilon_k, s_k \gamma_k} \left| r_k \epsilon_k \right\rangle \left\langle s_k \gamma_k \right| \tag{A2}$$

$$U_{k:j} \rho_j^{SE} U_{k:j}^\dagger = \sum_{\substack{r_k \epsilon_k s_k \gamma_k \\ r_j \epsilon_j s_j \gamma_j}} U_{r_k \epsilon_k, r_j \epsilon_j} \; \rho^{SE}_{r_j \epsilon_j, s_j \gamma_j} \; U^*_{s_k \gamma_k, s_j \gamma_j} \; \left| r_k \epsilon_k \right\rangle \left\langle s_k \gamma_k \right| . \tag{A3}$$

Note that the input and the output indices of the unitary operators have different subscripts denoting the time steps they belong to. We rewrite the last equation as a quantum map as

$$\rho_k^{SE} = \mathcal{U}_{k:j}[\rho_j^{SE}] = \sum_{\substack{r_k \epsilon_k s_k \gamma_k \\ r_j \epsilon_j s_j \gamma_j}} \mathcal{U}_{r_k \epsilon_k, r_j \epsilon_j; s_k \gamma_k, s_j \gamma_j} \; \rho^{SE}_{r_j \epsilon_j, s_j \gamma_j} \left| r_k \epsilon_k \right\rangle \left\langle s_k \gamma_k \right| . \tag{A4}$$

Finally, note that often we will omit the 'kets' and 'bras' from such equations.

As an example consider where unitary is action on SE and control operation is acting only on S:

$$\rho_2^S = \mathcal{U}_{2:1} \, \mathcal{A}_1 \, \mathcal{U}_{1:0} \, \mathcal{A}_0[\rho_0^{SE}] \tag{A5}$$

$$= \sum_{\overline{r_2 s_2}} \mathcal{U}_{r_2 \epsilon_2 x_1 \epsilon_1; s_2 \gamma_2 y_1 \epsilon_1} \mathcal{A}_{x_1 r_1; y_1 s_1} \mathcal{U}_{r_1 \epsilon_1, x_0 \epsilon_0; s_1 \gamma_1 y_0 \epsilon_0} \mathcal{A}_{x_0 r_0; y_0 s_0} \rho^{SE}_{r_0 \epsilon_0, s_0 \gamma_0} \left| r_2 \right\rangle \left\langle s_2 \right| \tag{A6}$$

$$= \sum_{\overline{r_2 s_2}} \prod_{j=0}^{1} \mathcal{U}_{r_{j+1} \epsilon_{j+1} x_j \epsilon_j; s_{j+1} \gamma_{j+1} y_j \epsilon_j} \mathcal{A}_{x_j r_j; y_j s_j} \rho^{SE}_{r_0 \epsilon_0, s_0 \gamma_0} \left| r_2 \right\rangle \left\langle s_2 \right| . \tag{A7}$$

Appendix B: Temporally correlated controls

Any CPTP operation acting on the system can be implemented by interacting the system with ancillary A. That is, $\mathcal{A}_j[\rho_j^S] = \mathrm{tr}_A[V_j \rho_j^S \otimes \rho_j^A V_j^\dagger]$. Two or more controls can be temporally correlated if the respective ancillas are initially correlated. Consider two correlated ancillas in state $\rho^A_{jj'}$. Then the operation $\mathcal{A}_{jj'}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_{jj'}[\rho_j^S] = \mathrm{tr}_A \left[V_j \mathcal{T}_{j:j'} \left[V_{j'} \rho_{j'}^S \otimes \rho^A_{jj'} V_{j'}^\dagger \right] V_j^\dagger \right] , \tag{B1}$$

where $V_{j'}$ is a unitary interaction between S and A spaces, $\mathcal{T}_{j:j'}$ represents the open dynamics of the system from j' to j. Next, another unitary interaction V_j between S and A spaces is applied. Thus the resultant operation $\mathcal{A}_{jj'}$ is a nonlocal in time. As an example, let the ancilla be in state $|\psi^+\rangle_{jj'} = (|00\rangle_{jj'} + |11\rangle_{jj'})/\sqrt{2}$. Then let us apply controlled-unitary operation $V_{j'}$ and V_j at two time steps j and j' respectively. Each local operation $\mathcal{A}_j$ and $\mathcal{A}_{j'}$ looks fully incoherent, while $\mathcal{A}_{jj'}$ is an entangling unitary operation. Hence, $\mathcal{A}_{jj'}$ is temporally entangled.

Appendix C: Proof of open quantum evolution ⇒ process tensor (Theorem 2)

To prove Theorem 2 we need to derive the process tensor from the open quantum evolution in Eq. (2) and show that it satisfies the three properties prescribed below Definition 1. We begin by writing down Eq. (2) in terms of matrix indices. The state of the system at the time step k is $\rho_k^S = \mathrm{tr}_E[\rho_k^{SE}]$, and is a function of $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0} = \{\mathcal{A}_{k-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_0\}$. We can write down this state

in terms of matrix indices of these maps:

$$\rho^S_{r_k,s_k} = \sum_{\substack{r_{k-1}\cdots r_0\\ x_{k-1}\cdots x_0}} \sum_{\substack{s_{k-1}\cdots s_0\\ y_{k-1}\cdots y_0}} \sum_{\substack{\epsilon_k\cdots\epsilon_0\\ \gamma_k\cdots\gamma_0}} \delta_{\epsilon_k\gamma_k} \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{U}_{r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1}x_j\epsilon_j;s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1}y_j\gamma_j} \mathcal{A}_{x_j r_j;y_j s_j} \rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0,s_0\gamma_0} \tag{C1}$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{r_{k-1}\cdots r_0\\ x_{k-1}\cdots x_0}} \sum_{\substack{s_{k-1}\cdots s_0\\ y_k\cdots y_0}} \left(\sum_{\substack{\epsilon_k\cdots\epsilon_0\\ \gamma_k\cdots\gamma_0}} \delta_{\epsilon_k\gamma_k} \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{U}_{r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1}x_j\epsilon_j;s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1}y_j\gamma_j} \rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0,s_0\gamma_0} \right) \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{A}_{x_j r_j;y_j s_j} \right) \tag{C2}$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{r_{k-1}\cdots r_0\\ x_{k-1}\cdots x_0}} \sum_{\substack{s_{k-1}\cdots s_0\\ y_k\cdots y_0}} \mathcal{T}_{r_k,x_{k-1}r_{k-1}\cdots x_0 r_0;s_k,y_{k-1}s_{k-1}\cdots y_0 s_0} \mathbf{A}_{x_{k-1}r_{k-1}\cdots x_0 r_0;y_{k-1}s_{k-1}\cdots y_0 s_0}, \tag{C3}$$

where the delta function in line one is the trace over the final state of E. In general, the initial state of the system can be correlated with the environment, which is not traced out until the final time step. Note that we have denoted the time-step indices as subscripts to matrix indices. Above, the process tensor and controls are defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_{r_k,x_{k-1}r_{k-1}\cdots x_0 r_0;s_k,y_{k-1}s_{k-1}\cdots y_0 s_0} = \sum_{\substack{\epsilon_k\cdots\epsilon_0\\ \gamma_k\cdots\gamma_0}} \delta_{\epsilon_k\gamma_k} \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{U}_{r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1}x_j\epsilon_j;s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1}y_j\gamma_j} \rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0,s_0\gamma_0} \tag{C4}$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{x_{k-1}r_{k-1}\cdots x_0 r_0;y_{k-1}s_{k-1}\cdots y_0 s_0} = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{A}_{x_j r_j;y_j s_j}. \tag{C5}$$

The element by element product in the last equation is simply a tensor product of operations $\mathcal{A}$ at different times. That is, the controls at different times are independent of each other. If these operations were correlated, as described in Appendix B, then we would have a more complex entity for Eq. (C5).

Linearity of the process tensor can be seen by substituting $\mathbf{A}_{\rm tot} = p\mathbf{A} + (1-p)\mathbf{B}$ into Eq. (C1) and finding $\mathcal{T}[\mathbf{A}_{\rm tot}] = p\mathcal{T}[\mathbf{A}] + (1-p)\mathcal{T}[\mathbf{B}]$. We can interpret this linearity by considering a coin with probabilities p and $1-p$ for 'heads' and 'tails' respectively. The coin is flipped and the outcome determines the choice of control operation, $\mathbf{A}^{(1)}$ or $\mathbf{A}^{(2)}$. Subsequently, the process outputs state $\mathcal{T}[\mathbf{A}^{(1)}]$ or $\mathcal{T}[\mathbf{A}^{(2)}]$. Interestingly, the value of p or $1-p$ need not be positive (aforementioned example aside); the linearity condition holds for any linear expansion of controls $\mathbf{A}$, so long as their combination remains a valid set of operations.

Complete positivity for the process tensor can be shown by casting it in the Sudarshan-Kraus-Choi form [52–55]; a linear map Λ is CP if and only if it can be decomposed as $\Lambda(\rho) = \sum_n L_n \rho L_n^\dagger$. In our case, we make use of the matrix form of unitary operations, $\mathcal{U}[\rho] = U\rho U^\dagger$, to split their action from the left and right as:

$$\rho^S_{r_k,s_k} = \sum_{\substack{r_{k-1}\cdots r_0\\ x_{k-1}\cdots x_0}} \sum_{\substack{s_{k-1}\cdots s_0\\ y_k\cdots y_0}} \sum_{\substack{\epsilon_k\cdots\epsilon_0\\ \gamma_k\cdots\gamma_0}} \delta_{\epsilon_k\gamma_k} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} U_{r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1}x_j\epsilon_j} \sqrt{\rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0,s_0\gamma_0}} \right) \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \mathcal{A}_{x_j r_j;y_j s_j} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{k-1} \sqrt{\rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0,s_0\gamma_0}} U^*_{s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1}y_j\gamma_j} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{r_{k-1}\cdots r_0\\ x_{k-1}\cdots x_0}} \sum_{\substack{s_{k-1}\cdots s_0\\ y_k\cdots y_0}} (T_l)_{r_k,x_{k-1}r_{k-1}\cdots x_0 r_0} \mathbf{A}_{x_{k-1}r_{k-1}\cdots x_0 r_0;y_{k-1}s_{k-1}\cdots y_0 s_0} (T_l)^*_{s_k,y_{k-1}s_{k-1}\cdots y_0 s_0}, \tag{C6}$$

where we have used the positivity of the initial state to take its square root. We have achieved the desired form and thus proven CP. From Eq. (C6), we can write the operators T_l in Eq. (3) of the main text as

$$(T_{\epsilon_k\cdots\epsilon_0\gamma_k\cdots\gamma_0})_{r_k,x_{k-1}r_{k-1}\cdots x_0 r_0} = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} U_{r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1}x_j\epsilon_j} \sqrt{\rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0,s_0\gamma_0}}, \tag{C7}$$

where $l = \epsilon_k\cdots\epsilon_0\gamma_k\cdots\gamma_0$.

Containment property of the process tensor— implying $\mathcal{T}_{k:j}$ contains $\mathcal{T}_{k':j'}$ for $j \le j' \le k' \le k$—can be seen by letting all controls from j to j' be the identity map. This yields the total S-E state $\rho^{SE}_{j'}$. Next, we allow arbitrary controls from j' to k' and then discontinue the evolution. This is just a special case of the procedure above with specific choices of controls outside of the interval $[j', k']$. However, within the interval, $\mathcal{T}_{k':j'}$ is fully constructed. ■

Appendix D: Proof that process tensor ⇒ open quantum evolution (Theorem 3)

Theorem 3 is a generalisation of the Stinespring dilation theorem [56]. In order to prove that all process tensors have a unitary representation, we first consider that, for a single time-step process, $\mathcal{T}_{1:0}[\mathcal{A}_0] = \rho_1 = \$(\mathcal{A}_0)[\rho_0]$, where ρ_0 is

some initial reduced state of the system and $ is a *supermap* [30], which maps operations on the system to other operations: $\$(\mathcal{A}_0)[\rho] = \mathcal{A}'_0[\rho]$. This description is possible due to the CP nature of the process tensor and its resulting Kraus decomposition (see Appendix C).

In Theorem 1 of Ref. [30] it is proven that the action of a supermap can always be represented as

$$\$(\mathcal{A}_0)[\rho] = \mathrm{tr}_{A_0}\left\{W(\mathcal{A}_0 \otimes \mathcal{I}_B)\left[Z\rho Z^\dagger\right] W^\dagger\right\}, \tag{D1}$$

where $Z : S \to S \times B_0$ and $W : S \times B_0 \to S \times A_0$ are isometries acting on the system and two ancillas A_0 and B_0, and we have written the identity map on the ancilla explicitly. Since the processes we are considering do not change the dimension of the system, we can take A_0 and B_0 to be the same and of dimension $d_{A_0} \geq d^2$. In this case W corresponds to a unitary map $\mathcal{W}$ on the joint system-ancilla space. Moreover, we can rewrite $Z\rho Z^\dagger = \mathcal{V}\left[\rho \otimes \tau_0\right]$, where $\mathcal{V}$ is another unitary map on the system-ancilla space and τ_0 is the initial state of the ancilla. Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{T}_{1:0}[\mathcal{A}_0] = \$(\mathcal{A}_0)[\rho_0] = \mathrm{tr}_{A_0}\left\{\mathcal{W}_{1:0}\mathcal{A}_0\mathcal{V}_0\left[\rho_0 \otimes \tau_0\right]\right\}. \tag{D2}$$

Here, $\mathcal{A}_0$ acts on the system alone; there is an implied identity map on the ancilla.

Let's assume that the process up to step $j-1$, $\mathcal{T}_{j-1:0}[\mathbf{A}_{j-2;0}]$ can be represented by unitary evolution of the form

$$\mathcal{T}_{j-1:0}[\mathbf{A}_{j-2;0}] = \mathrm{tr}_{E_{j-1}}\left\{\mathcal{W}_{j-1:j-2}\,\mathcal{A}_{j-2}\,\mathcal{V}_{j-2}\left[\ldots\left[\mathcal{W}_{1:0}\,\mathcal{A}_0\,\mathcal{V}_0\left[\rho_0 \otimes \tau_0\right] \otimes \tau_1\right]\ldots \otimes \tau_{j-2}\right]\right\} = \mathrm{tr}_{E_{j-1}}\left\{\rho^{SE}_{j-1}\right\}, \tag{D3}$$

where E_{j-1} is the environment consisting of ancillas A_0 to A_{j-2}. An additional step, with operation $\mathcal{A}_{j-1}$, can be added to the process by considering the evolution as another supermap $\$_j$ acting on the joint operation $\mathcal{A}_{j-1} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{E_{j-1}}$, the result of which then acts on the state ρ^{SE}_{j-1}. In other words, $\mathcal{T}_{j:0}[\mathbf{A}_{j-1;0}] = \mathrm{tr}_{E_{j-1}}\{\$_j(\mathcal{A}_{j-1} \otimes \mathcal{I}_{E_{j-1}})[\rho^{SE}_{j-1}]\}$. We can then use Eq. (D1) to write

$$\mathcal{T}_{j:0}[\mathbf{A}_{j-1;0}] = \mathrm{tr}_{E_j}\left\{\mathcal{W}_{j:j-1}\mathcal{A}_{j-1}\mathcal{V}_{j-1}\left[\rho^{SE}_{j-1} \otimes \tau_{j-1}\right]\right\}, \tag{D4}$$

where the new ancilla has dimension $d_{A_j} \geq d^{2(3^j)}$. This evolution is of the same form as Eq. (D3), thus by induction it follows from Eqs. (D2) & (D4) that the evolution in Eq. (D3) is valid for any time step.

If we define $\rho^{SE}_0 = \mathcal{V}_0[\rho_0 \otimes \tau_0] \otimes \tau_1 \cdots \otimes \tau_{k-1}$ as the initial system-environment state, then the process tensor is consistent with OQE as defined in Eq. (2) with $\mathcal{U}_{j:j-1} = \mathcal{V}_j\mathcal{W}_{j:j-1}$ for $j < k$ and $\mathcal{U}_{k:k-1} = \mathcal{W}_{k:k-1}$. ■

Appendix E: Linear construction of the process tensor

A convenient choice for $\{\mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)}\}$ is an informationally-complete positive-operator-valued measure (POVM) denoted as $\{\Pi^{(\mu)}\}$ with an update [57]. The update is a preparation of a fresh state $\{P^{(\nu)}\}$, which forms a linearly independent basis: $\mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)}(\rho) = P^{(\nu)}\mathrm{tr}[\Pi^{(\mu)}\rho]$, with $\sum_\mu \Pi^{(\mu)} = \mathbb{1}$; the operations themselves have a tensor product representation $\mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)} = P^{(\nu)} \otimes \Pi^{(\mu)}$, which we will use below (note that this is different from the representation in Ref. [35] by a partial transpose). By 'fresh' state $P^{(\nu)}$, we mean it is fully independent of the measurement outcome $\Pi^{(\mu)}$. Any operation can be written as a combination of measurement outcomes and preparations: $\mathcal{A}(\rho) = \sum_{(\mu,\nu)} \alpha_{(\mu,\nu)} P^{(\nu)}\mathrm{tr}[\Pi^{(\mu)}\rho]$. This decomposition is a linear (but non-convex) combination of coefficients $\alpha_{(\mu,\nu)}$. This is possible because both $\{P^{(\nu)}\}$ and $\{\Pi^{(\mu)}\}$ form a linearly independent basis on the state space of the system. The operations $\mathcal{A}$ form a convex set, but here we are utilising a linear expansion in terms of a fixed basis. Such an expansion cannot be convex. This procedure is simply a process tomography involving many time steps [58–60], which reduces to superchannel tomography for two time steps [17, 19]. As a simple example, consider the linear super-operator basis on one qubit $\mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)}(\rho) = \sigma_\mu\,\rho\,\sigma_\nu + \sigma_\nu\,\rho\,\sigma_\mu$, where σ_0 is the identity matrix and the rest are Pauli matrices. Then the action of any operation on a qubit can be written as $\mathcal{A}(\rho) = \sum_{(\mu,\nu)} \alpha_{(\mu,\nu)}\sigma_\mu\,\rho\,\sigma_\nu$.

The full control set on a set of time steps can also be cast as a linear combination of sequences of measurements and preparations at each time step. That is, $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0} = \sum_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}} \alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})} \bigotimes_{j=0}^{k-1} P^{(\nu_j)}_j \otimes \Pi^{(\mu_j)}_j$, where the notation $\vec{\eta}$ is shorthand for the list of indices $\{\eta_{k-1}, \cdots, \eta_1, \eta_0\}$ corresponding to each time step, and we have allowed for the basis $\{\mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)_j}_j\}$ to be different at different time steps. When the operations applied at each time step are independent, the coefficients can be decomposed into a product $\alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})} = \prod_j \alpha_{(\mu,\nu)_j}$.

Writing the state at time step k as the action of the process tensor on $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}$, we can use the above decomposition to express it in terms of a fixed set of basis states:

$$\rho_k(\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) = \mathcal{T}_{k:0}(\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) = \sum_{(\mu,\nu)_{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{(\mu,\nu)_0} \alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})}\,\rho_k\left(\mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)_{k-1}}_{k-1}; \mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)_{k-2}}_{k-2}; \ldots; \mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)_1}_1, \mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)_0}_0\right) \tag{E1}$$

$$= \sum_{(\mu,\nu)_{k-1}} \cdots \sum_{(\mu,\nu)_0} \alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})}\,\rho_k\left(P^{(\nu_{k-1})}_{k-1}, \Pi^{(\mu_{k-1})}_{k-1}; P^{(\nu_{k-2})}_{k-2}, \Pi^{(\mu_{k-2})}_{k-2}; \ldots; P^{(\mu_1)}_1, \Pi^{(\mu_1)}_1; P^{(\mu_0)}_0, \Pi^{(\mu_0)}_0\right). \tag{E2}$$

Let us further denote the basis states

$$\rho_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}) := \rho_k\left(P_{k-1}^{(\nu_{k-1})},\Pi_{k-1}^{(\mu_{k-1})};P_{k-2}^{(\nu_{k-2})},\Pi_{k-2}^{(\mu_{k-2})};\ldots;P_1^{(\mu_1)},\Pi_1^{(\mu_1)};P_0^{(\mu_0)},\Pi_0^{(\mu_0)}\right). \tag{E3}$$

These are the subnormalised states measured at k for a certain sequence $(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})$ of measurement outcomes and preparations chosen from a fixed set. The trace of one of these states gives the joint probability $p_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}) = \mathrm{tr}[\rho_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})]$ to measure the sequence of outcomes corresponding to POVM elements $\{\Pi_j^{(\mu_j)}\}$ given the set of preparations $P_j^{(\nu_j)}$. Quantum state tomography on the system after a given sequence of basis operations would give the normalised conditional state

$$\rho_k\left(P_{k-1}^{(\nu_{k-1})}\middle|\Pi_{k-1}^{(\mu_{k-1})};\ldots;P_0^{(\mu_0)},\Pi_0^{(\mu_0)}\right) = \frac{\rho_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})}{p_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})}. \tag{E4}$$

Eq. (E2) tells us that reconstructing the set of states $\rho_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})$ for all possible values of $(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})$ is sufficient to construct the state ρ_k for arbitrary choice of operations $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}$. We simply need to know the expansion coefficients for $\mathcal{A}_j$, i.e., $\{\alpha_{(\mu,\nu)_j}\}$. This is a consequence of the linearity of the process tensor: Given a set of operations, spanned by some control parameters, an experimentalist can test which operations are linearly independent—this is just a more involved version of quantum process tomography. By a linear inversion process, using $\mathcal{A}^{(\mu,\nu)_j}$ and $\rho_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})$ we can construct the map $\mathcal{T}_{k:0}$ which fully characterises the process up to time step k. Note again that the set of experiments we are prescribing here simply involve performing a POVM $\Pi_k = \{\Pi_k^{(\mu_k)}\}$ followed by an update $P_k = \{P_k^{(\nu_k)}\}$ at each time step. It is important to note that both Π_k and P_k only contain a finite number of elements. Performing (exponentially many) experiments with randomised measurements and preparations will sample from all possible combinations. The states $\rho_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})$ are simply deduced from quantum state tomography of the conditional states in Eq. (E4) and the statistics of the Π_k while holding all of the priors constant, since the POVM is informationally complete. We now give a lemma (also given in [61]) which allows us to construct the process tensor.

Lemma 9 *The process tensor can be constructed as*

$$\mathcal{T}_{k:0} = \sum_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}} \rho_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}) \otimes D_{\vec{\nu}}^T \otimes \Delta_{\vec{\mu}}^T. \tag{E5}$$

where $\{D_{\vec{\nu}}\}$ *and* $\{\Delta_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ *are the dual matrices to* $\{P_{\vec{\nu}}\}$ *and* $\{\Pi_{\vec{\mu}}\}$ *satisfying* $\mathrm{tr}[D_{\vec{\nu}'}\ P_{\vec{\nu}}] = \prod_j \delta_{\nu_j\nu_j'}$ *and* $\mathrm{tr}[\Delta_{\vec{\mu}'}\ \Pi_{\vec{\mu}}] = \prod_j \delta_{\mu_j\mu_j'}$.

Proof. We first prove that for any set of linearly independent matrices $\{P^{(\nu)}\}$ there exists the dual set $\{D^{(\nu)}\}$. Write $P^{(\nu)} = \sum_{\nu'} h_{\nu\nu'}\Gamma^{(\nu')}$, where $h_{\nu\nu'}$ are real numbers and $\{\Gamma^{(\nu')}\}$ form a Hermitian self-dual linearly independent basis satisfying $\mathrm{tr}[\Gamma^{(\nu)}\Gamma^{(\nu')}] = 2\delta_{\nu\nu'}$ [61]. Since $\{P^{(\nu)}\}$ form a linearly independent basis, the columns of matrix $\mathsf{H} = \sum_{\nu\nu'} h_{\nu\nu'}\,|\nu\rangle\langle\nu'|$ are linearly independent vectors, which means H has an inverse. Let matrix $\mathsf{J}^T = \mathsf{H}^{-1}$, then $\mathsf{H}\mathsf{J}^T = \mathbb{1}$, implying that the columns of J are orthonormal to the columns of H. We define $D^{(\nu')} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_j d_{\nu\nu'}\Gamma^{(\nu')}$, where $d_{\nu\nu'}$ are elements of J. The same proof applies to $\{\Pi^{(\mu)}\}$, whose dual set is $\{\Delta^{(\mu)}\}$: $\mathrm{tr}[\Delta^{(\mu')}\ \Pi^{(\mu)}] = \delta_{\nu\nu'}$. Since, $D_{\vec{\nu}} = \bigotimes_j D_j^{(\nu_j)}$, $\Delta_{\vec{\mu}} = \bigotimes_j \Delta_j^{(\mu_j)}$, $P_{\vec{\nu}} = \bigotimes_j P_j^{(\nu_j)}$ and $\Pi_{\vec{\mu}} = \bigotimes_j \Pi_j^{(\mu_j)}$, we have $\mathrm{tr}[D_{\vec{\nu}'}\ P_{\vec{\nu}}] = \prod_j \delta_{\nu_j\nu_j'}$ and $\mathrm{tr}[\Delta_{\vec{\mu}'}\ \Pi_{\vec{\mu}}] = \prod_j \delta_{\mu_j\mu_j'}$.

The action of the process tensor on a specific choice $P_{\vec{\nu}} \otimes \Pi_{\vec{\mu}}$ is given as

$$\mathcal{T}_{k:0}[P_{\vec{\nu}} \otimes \Pi_{\vec{\mu}}] = \sum_{\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}'} \rho_k(\vec{\mu}',\vec{\nu}')\ \mathrm{tr}[D_{\vec{\nu}'}\ P_{\vec{\nu}}]\ \mathrm{tr}[\Delta_{\vec{\mu}'}\ \Pi_{\vec{\mu}}] = \rho_k(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}). \tag{E6}$$

Its action is then defined on any control operation $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}$, by linearly expanding the latter in terms of $P_{\vec{\nu}} \otimes \Pi_{\vec{\mu}}$ and coefficients $\{\alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})}\}$. The above decomposition therefore provides an operational means to construct the process tensor. ∎

Appendix F: Proof that the process tensor has a matrix-product state representation (Theorem 4)

In this proof, we make use of Theorem 3 to represent the process tensor as an OQE with some environment; we further introduce a set of $2k$ ancillas each of d-dimensions, which along with the system, will be used to encode the many-body state. This theorem generalises the well-known Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism [62] to the process tensor.

Let us label the pair of ancillas to be used at the jth time step A_j and B_j, these are initialised in the maximally entangled state $|\psi^+\rangle_{A_jB_j} = \sum_{x_j=1}^d |x_jx_j\rangle/\sqrt{d}$. Let the total state of system–environment–ancillas at time step j be

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta_j = \sum \Theta_{r_j'\epsilon_j x_{j-1}y_{j-1}\cdots x_1y_1x_0y_0,s_j'\gamma_j w_{j-1}z_{j-1}\cdots w_1z_1w_0z_0} \\ \times |r_j'\epsilon_j x_{j-1}y_{j-1}\ldots x_1y_1x_0y_0\rangle\langle s_j'\gamma_j w_{j-1}z_{j-1}\ldots w_1z_1w_0z_0|\end{aligned} \tag{F1}$$

Above the indicies $\{r'_j, s'_j\}$ & $\{\epsilon_j, \gamma_j\}$ belong to S & E respectively, and $\{x_l, w_l\}$ & $\{y_l, z_l\}$ belong ancillas A_l and B_l respectively with $0 \leq l \leq j-1$. In each case the subscript on the index denotes the time step. Thus Θ_j includes ancillas $\{A_{j-1}B_{j-1}\dots A_0B_0\}$. Next we apply the SWAP operation $\mathbf{S}_j$ to S and ancilla A_j, defined as $\mathbf{S}\left|rx\right\rangle = \left|xr\right\rangle$. This gives us

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{S}_j^{SA}\Theta_j \otimes \left|\psi^+\right\rangle_{A_jB_j}\left\langle\psi^+\right| \mathbf{S}_j^{SA} =& \frac{1}{d}\sum \Theta_{r'_j\epsilon_j x_{j-1}y_{j-1}\cdots x_1y_1x_0y_0,s'_j\gamma_j w_j z_j\cdots w_1z_1w_0z_0}\left|x_j\epsilon_j r'_j x_j\right\rangle\left\langle y_j\gamma_j s'_j y_j\right| \\ &\otimes \left|x_{j-1}y_{j-1}\dots x_1y_1x_0y_0\right\rangle\left\langle w_{j-1}z_{j-1}\dots w_1z_1w_0z_0\right|. \end{aligned} \tag{F2}$$

In the last equation the first line contains $S_jE_jA_jB_j$ and the second line contains the previous ancillas $A_{j-1}B_{j-1}\cdots A_0B_0$. After the SWAP gate is applied the state is evolved to the next time step by the unitary map $\mathcal{U}_{j+1:j}$. The action of the unitary can written

$$\mathcal{U}_{j+1:j}\left(\left|x_j\epsilon_j\right\rangle\left\langle y_j\gamma_j\right|\right) = \sum \mathcal{U}_{r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1},r_j\epsilon_j;s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1},s_j\gamma_j}\left|r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1}\right\rangle\left\langle r_j\epsilon_j\right|\left(\left|x_j\epsilon_j\right\rangle\left\langle y_j\gamma_j\right|\right)\left|s_j\gamma_j\right\rangle\left\langle s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1}\right| \tag{F3}$$

$$= \sum \mathcal{U}_{r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1},r_j\epsilon_j;s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1},s_j\gamma_j}\left|r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1}\right\rangle\left\langle s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1}\right|\delta_{x_jr_j}\delta_{y_js_j}. \tag{F4}$$

Combining these equations, the total system–environment–ancilla state at the next time step is

$$\Theta_{j+1} = \mathcal{U}_{j+1:j}\mathbf{S}_j^{SA}\,\Theta_j \otimes \left|\psi^+\right\rangle_{A_jB_j}\left\langle\psi^+\right|\,\mathbf{S}_j^{SA} \tag{F5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}=& \frac{1}{d}\sum \mathcal{U}_{r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1},r_j\epsilon_j;s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1},s_j\gamma_j}\Theta_{r'_j\epsilon_j x_j y_j\cdots x_1y_1x_0y_0,s'_j\gamma_j w_j z_j\cdots w_1z_1w_0z_0}\left|r_{j+1}\epsilon_{j+1}r'_j r_j\right\rangle\left\langle s_{j+1}\gamma_{j+1}s'_j s_j\right| \\ &\otimes \left|x_{j-1}y_{j-1}\dots x_1y_1x_0y_0\right\rangle\left\langle w_{j-1}z_{j-1}\dots w_1z_1w_0z_0\right|. \end{aligned} \tag{F6}$$

Iterating Eq. (F6) with $\Theta_0 = \rho_0^{SE}$ and taking the trace over the environment, we find for a k-step process

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_k =& \mathrm{tr}_E[\Theta_k] \\ =& \frac{1}{d^k}\sum \delta_{\epsilon_k\gamma_k}\,\mathcal{U}_{r_k\epsilon_k r'_{k-1}\epsilon_{k-1};s_k\gamma_k s'_{k-1}\gamma_{k-1}}\dots\mathcal{U}_{r_2\epsilon_2 r'_1\epsilon_1;s_2\gamma_2 s'_1\gamma_1}\mathcal{U}_{r_1\epsilon_1 r'_0\epsilon_0;s_1\gamma_1 s'_0\gamma_0}\,\rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0;s_0\gamma_0} \\ &\times \left|r_k r'_{k-1}r_{k-1}\dots r'_1r_1r'_0r_0\right\rangle\left\langle s_k s'_{k-1}s_{k-1}\dots s'_1s_1s'_0s_0\right| \\ =& \frac{1}{d^k}\sum \mathcal{T}_{r_k\,r'_{k-1}\cdots r_1\,r'_0\,r_0;s_k\,s'_{k-1}\cdots s_1\,s'_0\,s_0}\left|r_k r'_{k-1}r_{k-1}\dots r'_1r_1r'_0r_0\right\rangle\left\langle s_k s'_{k-1}s_{k-1}\dots s'_1s_1s'_0s_0\right|. \end{aligned} \tag{F7}$$

This is clearly a density operator with matrix elements corresponding to the components of the process tensor.

To prove that the state in Eq. (F7) corresponds to a matrix-product state, we first realise that we can rewrite it as the matrix product density operator [63]

$$\Upsilon_k = \sum M_k^{r_kr'_{k-1}s_ks'_{k-1}}\cdots M_1^{r_1r'_0s_1s'_0}M_0^{r_0s_0}\left|r_k\,r'_{k-1}\dots r_1\,r'_0\,r_0\right\rangle\left\langle s_k\,s'_{k-1}\,\dots s_1\,s'_0\,s_0\right|, \tag{F8}$$

composed of $d_E^2 \times d_E^2$ matrices

$$M_j^{r_jr'_{j-1}s_js'_{j-1}} = \left\langle r_j\right|U_{j:j-1}\left|r'_{j-1}\right\rangle \otimes \left\langle s_j\right|U^*_{j:j-1}\left|s'_{j-1}\right\rangle, \tag{F9}$$

$j \neq 0, k$, and length d_E^2 row and column vectors

$$M_k^{r_kr'_{k-1}s_ks'_{k-1}} = \sum_\epsilon \left\langle r_k\epsilon\right|U_{k:k-1}\left|r'_{k-1}\right\rangle \otimes \left\langle s_k\epsilon\right|U^*_{k:k-1}\left|s'_{k-1}\right\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad M_0^{r_0s_0} = \sum_{\epsilon_0\gamma_0}\rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0;s_0\gamma_0}\left|\epsilon_0\gamma_0\right\rangle \tag{F10}$$

respectively—note that the superscripts here are *not* matrix indices. Given a decomposition of the initial state $\rho_0^{SE} = \sum_\lambda p_\lambda \left|\phi_\lambda\right\rangle\left\langle\phi_\lambda\right|$, then the latter vector can be rewritten as $M_0^{r_0s_0} = \sum_\lambda p_\lambda \left\langle r_0|\phi_\lambda\right\rangle \otimes (\left\langle s_0|\phi_\lambda\right\rangle)^*$.

Aside from the subsystems corresponding to the initial and final time steps, the state is pure. It can thus be represented as a (pure) matrix-product state with only two ancillas, using the results of Ref [63]:

$$\left|\psi_{\mathcal{T}_k}\right\rangle = \sum p_\lambda \left\langle r_k\epsilon\right|U_{k:k-1}\left|r'_{k-1}\right\rangle\left\langle r_{k-1}\right|U_{k-1:k-2}\left|r'_{k-2}\right\rangle\dots\left\langle r_1\right|U_{1:0}\left|r'_0\right\rangle\left\langle r_0|\phi_\lambda\right\rangle\left|r_kr'_{k-1}\dots r_1r'_0r_0\epsilon\,\lambda\right\rangle, \tag{F11}$$

which has bond dimension $D = d_E^2$. This completes the proof. ■

Appendix G: Subsystems of the CJI state

By taking the trace over all but two of the subsystems in Eq. (F7)—corresponding to primed and unprimed indices for adjacent time steps—we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}_{\overline{A_{j-1}B_j}}[\Upsilon_k] =& \sum \frac{1}{d^k}\mathcal{T}_{r_k\, r'_{k-1}\cdots r_j\, r'_{j-1}\cdots r_0; r_k\, r'_{k-1}\cdots s_j\, s'_{j-1}\cdots r_0}\, |r_j\, r'_{j-1}\rangle\langle s_j\, s'_{j-1}| \\ =& \sum \frac{1}{d^k}\mathcal{U}_{r_k\epsilon_k r'_{k-1}\epsilon_{k-1}; r_k\gamma_k r'_{k-1}\gamma_{k-1}} \cdots \mathcal{U}_{r_j\epsilon_j r'_{j-1}\epsilon_{j-1}; s_j\gamma_j s'_{j-1}\gamma_{j-1}} \cdots \mathcal{U}_{r_1\epsilon_1 r'_0\epsilon_0; r_1\gamma_1 r'_0\gamma_0} \\ & \times \rho^{SE}_{r_0\epsilon_0; r_0\gamma_0}\, |r_j\, r'_j\rangle\langle s_j\, s'_j| \\ =& \sum \frac{1}{d^j}\mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{U}_{j:j-1}\left[|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|_{SA_{j-1}} \otimes \ldots \mathrm{tr}_S\left\{\mathcal{U}_{2:1}\left[\mathbb{1}\otimes \mathrm{tr}_S\left\{\mathcal{U}_{1:0}\left[\mathbb{1}\otimes\rho_0^E\right]\right\}\right]\right\}\ldots\right]\right\} \\ =& \sum \mathcal{U}_{r_j\epsilon_j r'_{j-1}\epsilon_{j-1}; s_j\gamma_j s'\gamma_{j-1}}\rho^E_{\epsilon_{j-1}\gamma_{j-1}}\, |r\, r'\rangle\langle s\, s'| = (\mathcal{P}_{j:j-1}\otimes\mathcal{I})[|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|], \end{aligned} \tag{G1}$$

where ρ_j^E is the reduced state of the environment at time step j when the system is maximally mixed for all previous time steps. This is the CJI state for the CPTP map $\mathcal{P}_{j:j-1}$ resulting from an uncorrelated system interacting with the environment between time steps $j-1$ and j, averaged over the state of the system at all previous time steps. Consequently the reduced states of the two component systems are

$$\mathrm{tr}_{A_{j-1}}\left\{(\mathcal{P}_{j:j-1}\otimes\mathcal{I})[|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|]\right\} = \mathrm{tr}_E\left\{\mathcal{U}_{j:j-1}\left[\mathbb{1}/d\otimes\rho^E_{j-1}\right]\right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{tr}_{B_j}\left\{(\mathcal{P}_{j:j-1}\otimes\mathcal{I})[|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|]\right\} = \frac{\mathbb{1}}{d} \tag{G2}$$

respectively. Finally, when all but the subsystem corresponding to index r_0 is traced out, we are merely left with the initial system state $\mathrm{tr}_{S\{A_l B_{l\neq 1}\}}[\Upsilon_k] = \mathrm{tr}_E[\rho_0^{SE}] = \rho_0^S$.

Given the interpretation of the reduced states in Eq. (G1), we can ask, does Υ_k include the CJI states for 'average' CPTP maps between any pair of time steps l and j? The answer is affirmative; by projecting pairs of ancillas A_m and B_m onto the state $|\psi^+\rangle$, we can access those elements of the process tensor which correspond to applying the identity operation at time step m (projecting onto other maximally entangled states corresponds to applying one of the correction operations). We can thus reconstruct the CJI state for the map $\mathcal{P}_{j:l}$, where $0<l<j<k$, by projecting out all intermediate time step ancillas and tracing out all others:

$$(\mathcal{P}_{j:l}\otimes\mathcal{I})[|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|] = \mathrm{tr}_{\overline{A_{l-1}B_j}}\left[\bigotimes_{l<m<j}|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|_m\ \Upsilon_k\right]. \tag{G3}$$

This state can alternatively be constructed by omitting the SWAP operations between time steps l and j in Fig. 4 and tracing out over all ancillas that do not correspond to these times.

Appendix H: Proof of quantum Markov condition (Theorem 6)

The first statement follows trivially from the definition of a quantum Markov process: if the inequality in Eq. (6) holds, then the state at l depends on the past beyond the input $P_k^{(s)}$.

We now proceed to prove the converse statement: if the left and right sides of Eq. (6) are equal for a complete, linearly independent set of controls (see Appendix E), they will be equal for any pair of controls, implying that the process is Markovian. First, consider expanding the process tensor for a general control sequence, prior to a causal break, in terms of the basis $\{\mathcal{A}_j^{(\mu,\nu)_j}\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_l(P_k^{(s)},\Pi_k^{(r)};\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) =& \mathcal{T}_{l:0}\left(P_k^{(s)}\otimes\Pi_k^{(r)},\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}\right) \\ =& \sum_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu},\mu_k}\alpha_{r,\mu_k}\alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})}\,\rho_l\left(P_k^{(s)}\otimes\Pi_k^{(\mu_k)};\mathcal{A}_{k-1}^{(\mu,\nu)_{k-1}};\ldots;\mathcal{A}_1^{(\mu,\nu)_1};\mathcal{A}_0^{(\mu,\nu)_0}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{H1}$$

where we are using the same notation as in Appendix E. We have also expanded the POVM element $\Pi_k^{(r)} = \sum_{\mu_k}\alpha_{r,\mu_k}\Pi_k^{(\mu_k)}$ in terms of an informationally-complete set of basis POVM elements $\{\Pi_k^{(\mu_k)}\}$, and have assumed no further operations are applied between time steps k and l (the following proof straightforwardly generalizes to the case where later operations are applied).

Using Eq. (E4), we can rewrite Eq. (H1) in terms of conditional states as

$$\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}, \Pi_k^{(r)}; \mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) = \sum_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu},\mu_k} \alpha_{r,\mu_k}\alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})} p_l(\mu_k,\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}|\Pi_k^{(\mu_k)}; \mathcal{A}_{k-1}^{(\mu,\nu)_{k-1}}; \ldots; \mathcal{A}_1^{(\mu,\nu)_1}; \mathcal{A}_0^{(\mu,\nu)_0}), \tag{H2}$$

where $p_l(\mu_k,\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})$ is the joint probability distribution for the outcome corresponding to $\Pi_k^{(\mu_k)}$ as well as all previous basis operators. If we now assume that Eq. (6) holds for each of our finite set of basis elements, i.e., the conditional state is the same for each outcome $\Pi_k^{(\mu_k)}$ and for each set of basis operations $\{\mathcal{A}_j^{(\mu,\nu)_j}\}$, we can take the state out of the sum:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}, \Pi_k^{(r)}; \mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) &= \sum_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu},\mu_k} \alpha_{r,\mu_k}\alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})} p_l(\mu_k,\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}|\Pi_k^{(\mu_k)}; \mathcal{A}_{k-1}^{(\mu,\nu)_{k-1}}; \ldots; \mathcal{A}_1^{(\mu,\nu)_1}; \mathcal{A}_0^{(\mu,\nu)_0}) \\
&= \sum_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu},\mu_k} \alpha_{r,\mu_k}\alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})} p_l(\mu_k,\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}|\Pi_k^{(\mu'_k)}; \mathcal{A}_{k-1}^{(\mu,\nu)'_{k-1}}; \ldots; \mathcal{A}_1^{(\mu,\nu)'_1}; \mathcal{A}_0^{(\mu,\nu)'_0}) \\
&= \rho_l(P_k^{(s)}) \sum_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu},\mu_k} \alpha_{r,\mu_k}\alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})} p_l(\mu_k,\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}).
\end{aligned} \tag{H3}$$

Since, by definition, the conditional state $\rho_l(P_k^{(s)})$ is a trace one object, it must be that

$$\sum_{\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu},\mu_k} \alpha_{r,\mu_k}\alpha_{(\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu})} p_l(\mu_k,\vec{\mu},\vec{\nu}) = \mathrm{tr}[\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}, \Pi_k^{(r)}; \mathbf{A}_{k-1:0})] = p_l(\Pi_k^{(r)}; \mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}). \tag{H4}$$

Dividing through by this quantity in Eq. (H3), we find an expression for the overall conditional state

$$\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}|\Pi_k^{(r)}; \mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) = \frac{\rho_l(P_k^{(s)}, \Pi_k^{(r)}; \mathbf{A}_{k-1:0})}{p_l(\Pi_k^{(r)}; \mathbf{A}_{k-1:0})} = \rho_l(P_k^{(s)}), \tag{H5}$$

which is independent of the measurement outcome $\Pi_k^{(r)}$ and the past history of operations $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}$. Despite only assuming Eq. (6) holds for a fixed set of inputs, we have shown that is holds for *any* possible input prior to the causal break. Ergo, the process is Markovian. ■

Appendix I: Examples

We have given a necessary and sufficient conditions for a quantum process to be Markovian. Here, using our formalism we present examples where various non-Markovianity witnesses fail to detect non-Markovian behaviour. The importance of these witnesses should be stressed: they enable efficient criteria to determine whether a process is non-Markovian in many cases.

1. Divisible ≠ Markovian



Figure 6. *A divisible, but non-Markovian process.* Between the first and second time steps, the system is swapped with a maximally mixed environment; this is just the maximally incoherent map from the perspective of the system: $\Lambda_{t_2:t_1} = \mathbb{1}$. A controlled-NOT operation is then performed between time steps two and three. If the initial system state is unbiased in the logical basis ($\langle 0|\rho_S|0\rangle = \langle 1|\rho_S|1\rangle$), then this appears to be another maximally incoherent map on the system $\Lambda_{t_3:t_2} = \mathbb{1}$. The map from t_1 to t_3 is also maximally incoherent, $\Lambda_{t_3:t_1} = \mathbb{1} = \Lambda_{t_3:t_2} \circ \Lambda_{t_2:t_1}$, thus the process is divisible. However, the dynamics from t_2 to t_3 can be conditioned on the outcome of a σ_z measurement at t_1: $\Lambda_{t_3:t_2|0} = \mathcal{I} \neq \Lambda_{t_3:t_2|1} = \mathcal{X}$. The process is therefore non-Markovian according to Theorem 6.

The circuit depicted in Fig. 6 (example taken from Ref. [13]) leads to divisible, but non-Markovian, dynamics on the system, and is entirely classical when the system is initially diagonal in the basis of σ_z and measurements are only made in this basis. This demonstrates that witnesses based on divisibility fail to capture non-Markovian behaviour that only appears in multi-time correlations between observables.



Figure 7. *A* CP*-divisible, but non-Markovian process.* (a) A qubit system in an arbitrary state ρ_S evolves according to the Hamiltonian $H_{SE} = \frac{g}{2}\sigma_x \otimes \hat{x}$ along with an environmental position degree of freedom, which is initially uncorrelated with a Lorentzian wavefunction $\langle x\rangle\psi = \psi_E(x) = \sqrt{\gamma/\pi}/(x+i\gamma)$. (b) The reduced dynamics of the system is pure dephasing in the σ_z basis, and can be written exactly in GKSL form, i.e., if the system is not interfered with, the evolution between any two points is a CP-map of the following form: $\rho(t_j) = \exp(\mathcal{L}\delta t_{ij})[\rho(t_i)]$, where $\delta t_{ij} = t_j - t_i$. It is therefore CP-divisible [13–15, 26]. (c) If an $\mathcal{X}$ operation ($\mathcal{X}[\rho] = \sigma_x\rho\sigma_x$) is performed at some time t_2, then the dynamics reverses for a period δt_{12}, such that the state at time $t_2 + \delta t_{12}$ is equal to the initial state ρ_S up to a further $\mathcal{X}$ operation. The subsequent evolution is again pure dephasing. This behaviour constitutes a non-Markovian memory.

2. Snapshot Markovianity

A second, less contrived example is given in Ref. [37], and depicted here in Fig. 7. Here authors consider a qubit couple to continuous mode. They show that the exact dynamics of the qubit are fully CP-divisible, i.e., they are described by a time-independent generator $\mathcal{L}$ in Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad (GKSL) form. This implies $\Lambda_{t:0} = \Lambda_{t:\tau} \circ \Lambda_{\tau:0}$ for any $\tau < t$ and all $\Lambda_{x:y}$ are CPTP maps. Under this evolution, the off-diagonal elements of the qubit decay exponentially in time (resulting from the entanglement growth between system and environment). However, it is shown that applying an $\mathcal{X}$ operation to the system at time $t_2 > t_1$ and then at $2t_2 - t_1$ fully returns the system to its state at t_1. Reversal of this exponential decay, which occurs for a time that depends on the system's history, implies that the dynamics are non-Markovian even according to, for example, the trace-distance distinguishability criterion discussed below. By introducing a causal break, it is also straightforward, if tedious, to show that it is also non-Markovian according to Theorem 6.

However, in Ref. [22] a CPTP map Λ is defined to be Markovian if it can be written as $\Lambda = e^{\mathcal{L}}$. The motivation for this approach is to determine whether is Λ is related to a valid generator for GKSL dynamics. As mentioned already, the example of Ref. [37] leads to dynamics of exactly this form, with positive and time-independent rate coefficients. Therefore, the snapshot approach would find this example to be Markovian. As we have argued, these dynamics are indeed non-Markovian, demonstrating the limitations of the snapshot method.

3. Trace distance



Figure 8. *A monotonically trace-distance decreasing, but non-Markovian process.* (a) System and environment (both qubits) evolve under a partial swap operation $U_{j:i} = \exp(i\mathbf{S}\omega\delta t_{ij}) = \cos\omega(t_j - t_i)\mathbb{1}\otimes\mathbb{1} + i\sin\omega(t_2 - t_1)\mathbf{S}$. (b) If a measurement is made at some time t_2 and fresh pure state P is prepared, then the subsequent reduced dynamics $\Lambda(n,r)$ depends on the measurement outcome $\Pi^{(r)}$ and the choice of initial state $\rho_S^{(n)}$ at time t_1. However, for $\omega(t_3 - t_1) \leq \pi/2$, the process is monotonically trace-distance distinguishability decreasing.

Consider the circuit presented in Fig. 8. The initial state of the system-environment at time t_1 is $\rho_{SE}^{(n)}(t_1) = \rho_S^n \otimes \mathbb{1}/2$, where the initial system state is chosen from some fixed set, labelled by n. After evolution under the partial swap operation $U_{2:1} = \exp(i\mathbf{S}\omega\delta t_{12})$, the total state at some later time t_2 is given by $\rho_{SE}^{(n)}(t_2) = \cos^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\rho_S^n\otimes\mathbb{1}/2 + \sin^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\mathbb{1}/2\otimes\rho_S^n + i\cos(\omega\delta t_{12})\sin(\omega\delta t_{12})[\mathbf{S}, \rho_S^n\otimes\mathbb{1}/2]$. The action on the system alone corresponds to depolarising channel $\Lambda_{2:1} = \cos^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\mathcal{I} + \sin^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\mathbb{1}$, such that the state of the system at time t_2 is $\rho_S^n(t_2) = \cos^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\rho_S^n + \sin^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\mathbb{1}/2$.

Now suppose we initialise the system in two different states. The trace distance between these two states at a later time t_3 is

$$\operatorname{tr}|\rho_S^m(t_2) - \rho_S^n(t_2)| = \cos^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\operatorname{tr}|\rho_S^m - \rho_S^n|\,. \tag{I1}$$

This is a monotonically decreasing function in the interval $\omega\delta t_{13} \in [0, \pi/2]$. Therefore in this interval the process will be labeled Markovian as determined by the measure proposed in Ref. [23].

However, consider a measurement on the system $\{\Pi^{(k)}\}$ followed by preparation in pure state P at time t_2. The (normalised) total state after this causal break depends on the outcome of the measurement $\Pi^{(r)}$ and is given by $\rho_{SE}^{(n,r)}(t_2) = P \otimes \rho_E^{(n,r)}(t_2)$, where the operator on the environment is

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_E^{(n,r)}(t_2) =& \frac{\mathrm{tr}_S\left[\rho_{SE}^{(n,r)}(t_2)\Pi^{(r)}\right]}{\mathrm{tr}\left[\rho_{SE}^{(n,r)}(t_2)\Pi^{(r)}\right]} \\ =& \frac{\mathrm{tr}[\rho_S^n(t_2)\Pi^{(r)}]\cos^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\ \mathbb{1} + \mathrm{tr}[\Pi^{(r)}]\sin^2(\omega\delta t_{12})\ \rho_S^n + i\cos(\omega\delta t_{12})\sin(\omega\delta t_{12})\mathrm{tr}_S\left[\Pi^{(r)}[\mathbf{S}, \rho_S^n \otimes \mathbb{1}]\right]}{2\mathrm{tr}\left[\rho_S^n(t_2)\Pi^{(r)}\right]\cos^2(\omega\delta t_{12}) + \mathrm{tr}[\Pi^{(r)}]\sin^2(\omega\delta t_{12})}. \end{aligned} \tag{I2}$$

The crucial point is that, after the causal break, there are no correlations with the environment, and the state of the system is reset to a pure state. Moreover, independent of the choice of the initial system state, i.e. n, the trace distance between the states of the system is zero after the fresh preparation. However, the environment state still depends on the initial state of the system (and the measurement outcome). If we let the evolution continue to some time t_3, the state of the system is

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_S^n(t_3) =& \cos^2(\omega\delta t_{23})P + \sin^2(\omega\delta t_{23})\rho_E^{(n,r)}(t_2) + i\cos(\omega\delta t_{23})\sin(\omega\delta t_{23})\mathrm{tr}_S\left([\mathbf{S}, P \otimes \rho_E^{(n,r)}(t_2)]\right) \\ =& \Lambda(n,r)[P]. \end{aligned} \tag{I3}$$

This state is a function of $\rho_E^{(n,r)}(t_2)$, which in turn is a function of the initial choice n and measurement outcome r. Therefore, this process is operationally non-Markovian acoording to Theorem 6. For it to be operationally Markovian, the state of the system at t_3 (after the causal break) must only be a function of P, the system-environment unitary interaction, and the state of the environment, which *cannot* be a function of past states of the system.

We can test other non-Markovianity witnesses [64–67] in the same manner.

4. Non-Markovianity without correlations



Figure 9. *A non-Markovian process without S-E correlations.* The initial S-E state is the product state $\rho_S \otimes \rho_E$, where system and environment have the same dimension. After time t_1 a SWAP operation is performed between them, such that the state at time t_2 is $\rho_E \otimes \rho_S$. Another SWAP operation is then performed. The joint S-E state is always a product, i.e., there are never any S-E correlations. However, the system state at t_3 is always ρ_S (the state at t_1) independently of what operation is performed at t_2.

As we mentioned earlier, when the initial S-E correlations contribute to the dynamics of S, the process is non-Markovian. There are several witnesses for detecting initial S-E correlations [68–73]. However, correlations are not always important for quantum non-Markovian dynamics. Here we present a counter example.

Consider the two-step discrete process depicted in Fig. 9, where both the S-E unitaries are SWAP operations $\mathbf{S}$. We prepare any state ρ_S initially for the system, and the initial state of the environment is ρ_E. After the first SWAP operation, the system will be in state ρ_E, independent of its initial state. While the environment will be in in the state ρ_S. Now, once again we can make any operation on the system we like (including a causal break) and allow for the second step in the process to take place. Independent of our preparation at the intermediary step, the system's state at the next step will be the same as the initial state of the system ρ_S. Since the reduced dynamics between times t_2 and t_3 clearly depends on the system state at earlier time t_1, the process is non-Markovian according to Theorem 6. However, at no point in the process were there any correlations between the system and the environment. Note that if ρ_S and ρ_E are pure, then they also cannot be correlated to any third party.